



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Attorney Docket No. A34237

MBHB Case No. 04-941-A

In re the Application of:

Gye-Chool Lee

Serial No.: 09/843,354

Filed: April 26, 2001

For: METHOD FOR IDENTIFYING
BTS AND BSC IN IMT-2000
SYSTEM

Examiner: Hong Sol Cho

Group Art Unit: 2662

Confirmation No. 8507

Mail Stop Issue Fee
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL LETTER

Dear Sir:

In regard to the above identified application,

1. I am transmitting herewith the attached:
 - a) Issue Fee Transmittal Form – Form PTOL 85 – Part B;
 - b) Submission of Replacement Drawing Sheets;
 - c) Replacement Drawing Sheets;
 - d) Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance;
 - e) Check; and
 - f) Return receipt postcard.
2. With respect to fees:
 - a) A check for \$1,700.00 is enclosed to pay the Issue and Publication fees.
 - b) Please charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account, No. 13-2490.
3. CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 CFR § 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this Transmittal Letter and the paper, as described in paragraph 1 hereinabove, are being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Issue Fee, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on November 22, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 22, 2005

By: David L. Ciesielski
David L. Ciesielski
Reg. No. 57,432



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
Attorney Docket No. A34237
MBHB Case No. 04-941-A

In re the Application of:)	
)	
Gye-Chool Lee)	
)	Examiner: Hong Sol Cho
Serial No.: 09/843,354)	
)	Group Art Unit: 2662
Filed: April 26, 2001)	
)	Confirmation No. 8507
For: METHOD FOR IDENTIFYING)	
BTS AND BSC IN IMT-2000)	
SYSTEM)	

SUBMISSION OF REPLACEMENT DRAWING SHEETS

Mail Stop Issue Fee
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

We have now procured and enclose herewith replacement drawing sheets for Figures 3 and 5 (2 sheets) and annotated drawing sheets (2 sheets) showing the changes made to Figures 3 and 5, for the above-identified application. Figures 3 and 5 have been redrawn to correct a typographical error.

Prompt consideration of this submission is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 22, 2005

By: David L. Ciesielski
David L. Ciesielski
Registration No. 57,432



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Attorney Docket No. A34237

MBHB Case No. 04-941-A

In re the Application of:

Gye-Chool Lee

Serial No.: 09/843,354

Filed: April 26, 2001

For: METHOD FOR IDENTIFYING
BTS AND BSC IN IMT-2000
SYSTEM

)
)
)
) Examiner: Hong Sol Cho
)
) Group Art Unit: 2662
)
) Confirmation No. 8507
)
)
)

Mail Stop Issue Fee
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

The Applicant expresses appreciation for the allowance of the claims in the above-identified application. The Applicant notes the Examiner's Reasons for Allowance listed on a Notice of Allowability mailed November 5, 2004, but further comments that the art of record, alone and in combination, fails to show, teach or suggest the entirety of each combination of steps and/or structure recited by each of the allowed claims of the present invention.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's reasons for allowance are only warranted in instances in which the record of the prosecution as a whole does not make clear his or her reasons for allowing a claim or claims. In light of the original disclosure, previous Office Actions and responses, however, the Applicant believes that the record as a whole does make the reasons for allowance clear. The Applicant does not necessarily agree with each statement in the reasons for allowance. The Applicant believes that the statement of reasons for allowance in this case is improper as it merely paraphrases or copies limitations of the claims into the reasons for allowance. While the Applicant


believes that the claims are allowable, the Applicant does not acquiesce that patentability resides in the features, as explicitly set forth in the claims, nor that each feature is required for patentability.

Respectfully submitted,

**McDonnell Boehnen
Hulbert & Berghoff LLP**

Date: November 22, 2005

By:


David L. Ciesielski
Reg. No. 57,432